

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(San Joaquin)

----

In re S.M., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court  
Law.

C094552

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES  
AGENCY,

(Super. Ct. No. STK-JD-DP-  
2020-0000296)

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

T.M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

T.M., mother of the minor (mother), appeals from the juvenile court's order after the six-month review hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 366.21, subd. (e), 395.)<sup>1</sup> As she did in her related appeal from the juvenile court's jurisdictional and dispositional orders (case No. C093716, of which we hereby take judicial notice), mother asserts the juvenile

---

<sup>1</sup> Undesignated statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

court lacked subject matter jurisdiction under the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA). She further asserts the juvenile court's finding of reasonable services was not supported by substantial evidence, arguing there was a failure to provide counseling and therapy to the minor to facilitate her relationship with mother, a failure to make a psychotropic medication assessment of mother, and unreasonable delay in the provision of services.

The San Joaquin County Human Services Agency (Agency) argues, as it did in related case No. C093716, that mother forfeited her UCCJEA claim for failure to raise it below (*In re J.W.* (2020) 53 Cal.App.5th 347, 352) and, in any event, the UCCJEA does not override the juvenile court's ability to take jurisdiction over the minor under section 300 related to an incident that takes place in California, where fundamental jurisdiction over dependency cases is governed by section 300. The Agency further argues the reasonable services finding was supported by substantial evidence.

We concluded, in related case No. C093716, that the juvenile court did not properly comply with the UCCJEA and, as such, reversed the jurisdictional and dispositional orders and remanded with directions to comply with the requirements of the UCCJEA. Our prior decision has rendered mother's challenge moot and we therefore dismiss the appeal.

"It is well settled that an appellate court will decide only actual controversies. Consistent therewith, it has been said that an action which originally was based upon a justiciable controversy cannot be maintained on appeal if the questions raised therein have become moot by subsequent acts or events." (*Finnie v. Town of Tiburon* (1988) 199 Cal.App.3d 1, 10.) A question becomes moot when, during the pendency of an appeal, events transpire that prevent a court from granting any effectual relief. (See *Lester v. Lennane* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 536, 566; see also *Consol. etc. Corp. v. United A. etc. Workers* (1946) 27 Cal.2d 859, 863.) In such cases, the court will not proceed to a formal judgment, but will dismiss the appeal. (*Consol. etc. Corp.*, at p. 863;

see *Cucamongans United for Reasonable Expansion v. City of Rancho Cucamonga* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 473, 479 [“[a]n appeal should be dismissed as moot when the occurrence of events renders it impossible for the appellate court to grant appellant any effective relief”].)

Mother’s appeal is moot, as we cannot provide her any meaningful relief in this appeal, and there remains no justiciable controversy on the issue of jurisdiction.

(*In re Pablo D.* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 759, 761; *In re Michelle M.* (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 326, 330.)

#### DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/S/  
MAURO, J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
/S/  
HULL, Acting P. J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/S/  
DUARTE, J.